United Nations DP/2008/47

Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and of the United Nations Population Fund

Distr.: General
18 August 2008

Original: English

Second regular session 2008
8 to 12 September 2008, New York
Item 3 of the provisional agenda
Evaluation

Management response to the evaluation of the role and contribution of UNDP in the environment and energy*

Contents

Chapter		*Page*
I.	Background and context	2
II.	Overview of the management response	2
III.	Clarifications and additional information	6
IV.	Looking forward	8
Annex		
1.	Recommendations and management responses	9
	Annexes 2 through 8 are available on the Executive Board web page	
2.	Overview of sources of funding for environment and energy work in UNDP	
3.	Environment and energy communities of practice	
4.	Summary of programme expenditures under the multi-year funding framework	
5.	Alignment of environment and energy teams in regional service centres	
6.	Strategic plan key result area: mobilizing environmental finance	
7.	Total GEF grants and related co-financing related to GEF-funded projects in UNDP, 1991-2008	
8.	Increased programmatic focus in UNDP under the multi-year funding framework	

*The compilation of data required to provide the Executive Board with the most current information has delayed submission of the present report.

08-46404 (E) 020908

I. Background and context

1. The present report summarizes the response of UNDP management to the evaluation of the role of UNDP in the environment and energy. The evaluation was mandated by the Executive Board at its annual session 2006, as part of the work plan of the Evaluation Office. It was conducted in 2007-2008 by a core team of two external consultants and two staff from the Evaluation Office, with support from eight other external consultants working in case-study countries and a three-person advisory panel.

2. The evaluation focused on two main issues: (a) UNDP contributions to environment and energy in relation to its main mission of poverty reduction; and (b) how effectively UNDP has used the financial resources that were made available from regular ('core') and external sources. The evaluation also looked at (c) how effectively UNDP has mainstreamed environmental management across its entire range of programming, (d) how UNDP has allocated and mobilized resources for the environment and energy; and (e) the role of UNDP within the United Nations system, especially with respect to its relationship and division of responsibility with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).

3. The Evaluation Office adopted a case study approach in conducting this evaluation. Case studies from eight countries (Burkina Faso, China, Ecuador, Fiji and Samoa, Kenya, Macedonia, and Malawi) formed the principal source of information for the evaluators. In addition, consultations were held with the UNDP regional service centres in Bangkok and Bratislava; UNEP headquarters, in Nairobi, and UNEP regional office, in Bangkok; and international organizations such as the World Bank, the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the World Conservation Union, and the World Resources Institute.

4. A draft report was circulated for internal review and comment on 20 February 2008, and the main findings and conclusions of this report were presented to an informal session of the Executive Board shortly thereafter. The draft report gave rise to approximately 80 pages of comments from the Environment and Energy Group, UNDP country offices, and other units across UNDP. A revised report was issued on 22 May 2008.

II. Overview of the management response

5. UNDP management welcomes the frank assessment of the UNDP work in the field of environment and energy for sustainable development. While noting the many challenges facing this critical field, both within UNDP and in the world at large, UNDP management is encouraged by, and highly supportive of, the evaluation's primary conclusion: *that environment and energy are central to the mission of UNDP.*

6. UNDP recognized that fact more than 20 years ago, when the principle of sustainable human development came into sharper focus, and especially leading up to the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in 1992. Emerging from that conference as one of the three implementing agencies of the newly-established GEF, UNDP has kept environmental issues high on its agenda ever since. This was reconfirmed in the strategic plan, 2008-2011, where "environment and sustainable development" is one of only four programmatic focal areas.

7. Indeed, support to the environment and energy is an integral part of the UNDP mandate and mission. As the lead development arm of the United Nations, the UNDP mandate to promote sustainable development can only be achieved with a clear focus on (a) the sustainable use and management of environmental and natural resources, and (b) access to, and the sustainable use of, energy, especially for the poor. The comparative advantages of UNDP in those areas are clear: (a) UNDP is the largest of the United Nations development

organizations on the ground in developing countries; (b) UNDP is in a position to link environmental concerns to broader development issues, such as democratic governance, poverty reduction and disaster risk reduction; (c) UNDP is one of the main implementing agencies of GEF, a key implementing arm of the Montreal Protocol, and home to the GEF Small Grants Programme; and (d) UNDP hosts the United Nations resident coordinator system.

8. Moreover, UNDP *has* to work in the area of the environment, because the poorest countries are precisely those that have suffered the most as a result of environmental degradation. The cycle of poverty, environmental degradation, and even more poverty has largely been ignored by investors, funds and development banks. Where national and regional capacities are the weakest is where UNDP is needed the most. This is especially true in the area of access to energy and water and with respect to the emerging threat of climate change, which will affect national development for years to come.

9. Working to meet those challenges, UNDP has been a key player in environment and sustainable development over the past years. The evaluation highlighted a number of achievements, noting that UNDP has:

(a) made "significant contributions to international environmental efforts" and is now "among the leading global organizations working in these areas" (page xi);

(b) built up a "specialized and capable technical team at headquarters and in the regional centers that is a credit to the organization" (page xii);

(c) produced "high-quality analytical knowledge products recognized for their value in policy dialogue, advocacy and awareness raising" (page xi);

(d) developed and implemented high-quality environmental projects that are "impressive and innovative as stand-alone initiatives" (page 24); and

(e) implemented GEF projects efficiently and "made a significant contribution to its overall success" (page 72).

10. UNDP management is appreciative of these findings and credits its highly dedicated and professional staff working in this area with the outstanding results.

11. Nevertheless, UNDP is also mindful of the many caveats that were attached to the findings throughout the report. Those caveats point to important issues that will require the focused attention of UNDP management in the coming years. While many of the issues raised have already received considerable attention, UNDP acknowledges that much work remains to be done. The most pressing issues are outlined below.

UNDP needs to add to its financial resource base for environmental programming in addition to the substantial base already provided by GEF (conclusions 4 and 9).

12. While the evaluation repeatedly notes that GEF-funded projects and programmes have generally been of the highest quality, management takes note that the UNDP focus on GEF funding has brought about a number of unintended and undesirable consequences. Although UNDP takes issue with the exact magnitude of that reliance as spelled out in the evaluation (see annex 2), this issue was recognized some time ago, and UNDP has taken steps to augment its funding base. In addition to the significant level of resources provided at the national level by bilateral donors or by the programme countries themselves, UNDP has recently seen a number of important successes at the global level in adding to its resource base. For example:

(a) The *Government of Spain* is channeling $62.5 million through UNDP under the Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund for environment and climate change;

(b) The *Gates Foundation* committed $19 million to promote energy access for the poor in West Africa; and

(c) The *Government of Japan* is providing $92.7 million through UNDP to support climate change adaptation in Africa.

UNDP needs to mainstream environmental considerations throughout all of its development programmes (conclusions 6 and 9).

13. UNDP faces a dilemma in this regard. UNDP has made a firm commitment to promoting the visibility and prominence of environmental concerns by making 'environment and sustainable development' one of its four main focus areas, and by establishing 'environment and energy' as a distinct practice for. On the other hand, this very prominence has sometimes allowed environmental management within UNDP to proceed with a certain degree of isolation from the other practices. Efforts have been made in recent years to bridge the divide by focusing more attention on the environmental dimensions of poverty, governance, crisis prevention and gender. Examples of such cross-fertilization include UNDP support to:

(a) the Environment and Security Initiative (http://www.envsec.org/);
(b) the Poverty-Environment Partnership (http://www.povertyenvironment.net/pep/);
(c) the Global Compact (http://www.unglobalcompact.org/);
(d) the Poverty and Environment Initiative (http://www.unpei.org/);
(e) the Joint Gender and Environment and Energy Action Plan; and
(f) the Programme on Governance and Poverty: Land Governance

14. UNDP acknowledges that much remains to be done, especially in developing and implementing environmental and social safeguards for its programming, and further integrating the work of environment units at the country level with UNDP work in the areas of poverty reduction, democratic governance and crisis prevention. The first issue is currently being tackled through work under way to augment the UNDP 'Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures' (also known as the User Guide).

UNDP needs to strengthen country offices further to permit them to respond more effectively to national priorities and promote sustainable environmental management in programme countries conclusions 3 and 5).

15. UNDP greatest strengths are its country offices, its significant operational presence on the ground, and its decentralized approach to supporting countries in achieving their own development objectives. While noting that the evaluation reviewed only eight country offices, providing a limited view of UNDP capacities. UNDP management acknowledges that these capacities need to be continually upgraded if UNDP is to continue as a valued partner in the national development process. Three efforts to that end include UNDP support to:

(a) *Environment and energy community of practice* (http://www.undp.org/energyand environment/). UNDP established six core thematic 'practice areas' in 2000. Staff were encouraged to join these global communities of practice to sharpen their skills and contribute to the growing UNDP 'global knowledge networks'. To date, more than 1,400 staff members have joined the 'environment and energy' practice, and most of them – including over 300 environment and energy focal points – are based in country offices. Examples of knowledge-sharing and capacity-building across the network are included in annex 3.

(b) *Regional service centres*. UNDP support to the regions has come through strengthened regional service centres, which are key to providing direct support to country offices, strengthening country office capacities, and generating knowledge products across each region. The Environment and Energy Group (including GEF and other units) has more than 70 staff outposted to regional service centres and other field-based locations.

(c) *Country office capacity-building*. UNDP has provided a considerable amount of training and capacity-building to country office staff. For example, in 2007 and 2008 UNDP supported four regional community of practice meetings; six regional training meetings on climate change attended by 138 senior management staff; and numerous missions under the Poverty and Environment Initiative.

UNDP needs to build on its central role within the United Nations development system to realize the potential of its country-level operational strengths and country-driven focus for environment and sustainable development (conclusion 7).

16. UNDP has three principal avenues for doing this. The first is its role in the United Nations Development Group (UNDG), where environmental considerations should be part of all United Nations country team analyses and programmes. Second, as host to the United Nations resident coordinator system, UNDP needs to ensure that resident coordinators have the information and tools they need to promote sustainable environmental management as part of the broader United Nations development agenda. Third, UNDP needs to continue strengthening its unique partnership with UNEP, focusing on country-level operations in tandem with the broader normative and scientific role of UNEP. UNDP has recently made progress on all three fronts as described below, but recognizes that it needs to do much more:

(a) *UNDG*. UNDP is working with UNDG within the framework of the Working Group on Programming Issues to (a) enhance guidance and support on mainstreaming environmental sustainability in programming, and (b) integrate climate change into programming.

(b) *United Nations resident coordinators*. Within the past eight months, and especially leading up to the Bali climate conference in December 2007, UNDP organized a series of regional consultations with 61 UNDP resident representatives/United Nations resident coordinators, 37 UNDP deputy resident representatives and country directors, and 40 other senior staff members, to raise awareness, provide guidance and build capacities for these key United Nations country team members.

(c) *UNEP*. UNDP is negotiating the renewal its 3-year memorandum of understanding with UNEP, including specific annexes containing detailed agreements and working arrangements on the Poverty and Environment Initiative and issues such as climate change adaptation.

UNDP needs to continue rolling out improved results-based management systems to better monitor progress and better align resources with country demands and strategic priorities (conclusions 2 and 8).

17. A number of issues highlighted in the evaluation are not unique to UNDP environment and energy work, but represent more systemic challenges that UNDP faces. In response to these challenges, UNDP launched an enhanced results-based management platform in February 2008 that: (a) includes *tools for managing for results* in support of national development priorities; (b) provides UNDP with *performance data* for accountability purposes, organizational learning and decision-making; and (c) provides the substantive basis for *communicating UNDP results* to the general public. Progress has also been made during 2008 on other enhancements, including:

(i) Revising the results management section of the User Guide to give clearer corporate standards for setting realistic outcomes, selecting indicators and monitoring progress;

(ii) Developing guidelines for monitoring and reporting on the development results framework of the strategic plan at the country, regional and corporate levels; and

(iii) Providing regional workshops and dedicated support to improving management for results, focused on assessing the improvement in UNDP and national capacities for planning, monitoring and reporting through face-to-face and online learning.

18. In spite of this, UNDP management is well aware of the challenges it faces in tracking results. On the one hand, UNDP is only one development partner among many at the country level, and its specific contributions to overall development progress is therefore difficult to measure. On the other, given its stated goal of supporting national development priorities, and given the array of priorities it faces working across a wide range of countries, UNDP faces the significant challenge of aggregating and consolidating a summary of its own results. Nevertheless, UNDP management is committed to serving the needs of both programme countries and donor countries.

19. Specific actions to be undertaken by the various UNDP units in each of these areas over the coming months and years is provided in the summary tables beginning on page 9, which address point by point the specific recommendations made by the evaluation team.

III. Clarifications and additional information

20. Before responding to the specific recommendations made by the evaluation, UNDP management would like to highlight a number of issues raised by evaluation report that management feels could be viewed in a different light or interpreted in a different way.

21. *The evaluation is based for the most part on case studies conducted in only eight of more than 130 programme countries.* Without necessarily disputing the findings in those eight countries, UNDP feels that there is a tendency in the evaluation to over-generalize and apply the findings across the whole of UNDP. For example, the evaluation states that "country office environment and energy teams do not appear strong and only rarely participate in high-level policy discourse with governments and other donors on environment and energy topics outside the areas of specific interest to GEF" (page xiii). While recognizing the need to strengthen country offices, UNDP can point to many cases in which its staff, consultants and projects have engaged governments and donors at the highest levels on a wide variety of environmental issues.

22. *The evaluation seems to unfairly target the environment and energy area for issues that apply to UNDP as a whole.* For example, one criticism is that "environment and energy programmes in UNDP have relied predominantly on outside funding" (page 72). This is true of all UNDP programmes. Under the multi-year funding framework (MYFF) 2004-2007, only 15 percent of programme expenditures came from regular resources ($2.14 billion out of $14.29 billion total). The figure for environment and energy was 13 per cent ($0.16 billion out of $1.26 billion total). Details can be found in annex 4. That said, UNDP is aware of the need to allocate more core resources to environment and energy and diversify away from its over-reliance on GEF resources.

23. *Certain of the conclusions drawn are outside the scope of the evaluation.* For example, the evaluators conclude that "there are few obvious signs of genuine improvements in government capacities for environmental management over the last decade or two" (page 72). That sweeping generalization is clearly outside the scope of the evaluation, which drew the bulk of its information from only eight country-level case studies. This is not to say that the task of national capacity development is anywhere near complete: indeed, it is the *raison d'être* of UNDP. But in the area of the environment and energy, UNDP feels that a blanket dismissal of progress over the past 20 years is neither helpful nor accurate. Environmental issues are higher on national agendas today than perhaps at any time in history. Nonetheless, UNDP acknowledges that these issues are often overwhelmed by

competing priorities related to rapid economic development on the one hand or crushing poverty (or political instability) on the other.

The report contains certain inconsistencies and oversimplifications.

24. For example, the evaluation criticizes UNDP for allowing "priority national environmental issues, such as environmental health, water supply and sanitation and energy management, to be replaced by GEF priorities" (page viii). While there is some truth to this, the finding masks a more complex reality. It also ignores what is stated elsewhere in the report, that "the primary mandate for water supply and sanitation and urban slums lies with UNICEF and UN-Habitat respectively" (page 10). The report could have added that the mandate for environmental health lies primarily with the United Nations Industrial Development Organization and the World Health Organization, and that energy development and management are generally connected with major infrastructure projects that are mainly under the purview of development banks.

25. This not to say that UNDP has no interest or internal capacity in those areas. Far from it; UNDP is active across all of them. For example, in the area of climate change, the key objective of UNDP is to promote sustainable energy development and encourage activities that generate multiple development benefits. Those benefits come in the form of reducing the energy bill of oil-importing countries; increasing energy security; providing increased access to energy for the poor; and reducing the damage to local environmental health. In all of those cross-sectoral areas, UNDP work should be (a) undertaken in close collaboration with other relevant United Nations organizations or development banks; (b) approached from the angle of capacity development; and (c) aligned with the priorities laid out in the strategic plan, especially to support the mainstreaming of environmental concerns into national development strategies. In other words, the role of UNDP is more cross-cutting than sectoral.

26. Finally on this point, the evaluators fail to recognize that (a) the "GEF priorities" are inter-governmentally mandated environmental priorities that are directly linked to sustainable development, and (b) GEF has moved its emphasis towards programming that links global benefits more directly with the achievement of national and local sustainable development priorities. As a GEF implementing agency, UNDP was implementing – and implementing effectively – the policy on environmental financing that was agreed by the international community. There may by difference between GEF and "other" environmental priorities, but it is not as dramatic as the evaluation suggests.

The evaluation tends to dwell on problems that are well recognized and which have already been solved or which are in the process of being solved.

27. The evaluation comments on the challenges related to integrating GEF and non-GEF environmental work in regional centres, noting that "while these are promising initiatives, time will tell whether they become successful and can be replicated in other areas" (page ix). In fact, the environmental work in Bratislava has been integrated since 2005 and is an unqualified success. Bangkok and Panama are following suit. In the third quarter of 2007, the Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean (RBLAC) agreed with the Bureau for Development Policy (BDP) to share the financing of the position of a regional practice leader, who was tasked with leading an integrated environment and energy practice in the region. The integrated practice joins the financial resources of the RBLAC regional programme with the human and financial resources of BDP, including regional policy and technical advisors financed by the global cooperation framework and GEF. In the Regional Bureau for Asia and the Pacific (RBAP), synchronization across all environment and sustainable development activities is being pursued through aligning the work of key

internal units including BDP, the Environment and Energy Group, GEF, RBAP and country offices. Further information is contained in annex 5.

28. A similar example relates to the alignment of GEF and the broader Environment and Energy Group at headquarters: "Further integration or convergence of GEF teams with the rest of the Environment and Energy Group remains challenging, however" (page xiii). In fact, the full operational alignment of the Environment and Energy Group and GEF went into effect on 1 July 2008.

29. A third example is the relationship between UNDP and UNEP: "A review of longer-term cooperation has revealed that competition for resources, incompatibilities in organizational cultures and systems, a lack of clarity over respective roles at the field level, and lingering distrust among staff are in some cases still proving hard to overcome" (page xiv). This is significantly overstated. UNDP and UNEP are in the process of renewing their long-standing memorandum of understanding with detailed working agreements in areas such as poverty and the environment, and climate change.

The evaluation still contains a number of factual errors or unjustified interpretations.

30. One important example is the assertion that the UNDP strategic plan, 2008-2011, "does not acknowledge or react to the major issues relating [to] the high level of dependence on GEF resources" (page xiv). On the contrary, the second key result area under environment and sustainable development is to mobilize environmental finance for developing countries apart from GEF. A review of the relevant section of the strategic plan is included in annex 6.

31. A second important example is the claim that "there was little sense that GEF resources came in response to a prioritization of overall environment energy needs and opportunities at national levels" (page 66) In fact, GEF cannot fund projects and programmes that are outside stated national development priorities, or without specific requests for assistance from programme countries. While it is true that the *Global* Environment Facility was and is designed to deal with *global* environmental challenges, UNDP has secured more than $2 in co-financing for every dollar provided by GEF (although many of those funds do not pass through UNDP books). This amounted to $5.56 billion in co-financing mobilized by UNDP for environmental initiatives during the period 1991-2008. By definition, such co-financing aim to bring about *national* benefits, while GEF funds pay for *global* benefits. Further information is included in annex 7.

32. A final example is the blanket assertion in the evaluation that "there is virtually no sign that UNDP's global plans and strategies have had any significant influence on the allocation of financial resources or the selection of programme priorities and activities for the decentralized country programmes" (page ix). Not only is this assertion outside the scope and competence of the evaluation, UNDP has made significant efforts to focus, as discussed in annex 8.

IV. Looking forward

33. Notwithstanding these several clarifications, UNDP is appreciative of the frank assessment of the many challenges and even shortcomings in its environment and energy work that are highlighted in the evaluation. UNDP is committed to facing those challenges. Specific actions, responsible parties, and deadlines are provided in annex 1.

Annex 1. Recommendations and management responses

Evaluation recommendation 1. ***UNDP should demonstrate more clearly the pursuit of its defined mandate in environment and energy rather than the specific priorities of a limited number of major donors or funds.***

Management response

UNDP has done so, at least at the global level. The mandate of UNDP with regard to environment and energy is to (a) promote the sustainable management of environmental resources within the broader context of sustainable human development, and (b) promote the link between sustainable environmental management and poverty reduction, democratic governance and crisis prevention. During the previous MYFF cycle, UNDP formulated its environmental service lines exactly in line with GEF and Montreal Protocol programme areas: biodiversity conservation, sustainable land management, international water protection, chemicals management, etc. Under the strategic plan, 2008-2011, however, UNDP has defined its environmental objectives in line with its mandate and higher-level strategic priorities, rather than narrow technical areas. These strategic objectives include helping countries to: (a) mainstream environmental considerations into national development planning; (b) mobilize environmental finance from sources other than the well-established global funds; (c) adapt to climate change; and (d) strengthen local management of environmental resources. UNDP needs to refine its strategies further in each of its four main key results areas. A comprehensive strategy for supporting climate-change adaptation has been developed and approved.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking*	
			Status	Comments
1.1 As part of the strategic planning process, formulate strategic environment and energy priorities corresponding with UNDP mission and capabilities.	Jan. 2007 – July 2008	BDP/Environment and Energy Group (EEG) and Operations Support Group	In progress	This work was undertaken during development of the strategic plan, 2008-2011
1.2 Refine strategic environment and energy priorities in key result areas reflecting a realistic niche for UNDP as well as the needs in the poorest countries; identify resource gaps; and present these to donors.	July 2007 – Dec. 2008	BDP/EEG	In progress	A climate-change strategy has been developed and approved as a first step.
1.3 Prepare regular reports on the source and allocation of financial and human resources to the goals, priorities, and programmes adopted.	Annually from Dec. 2008 – Dec. 2011	BDP/EEG		

Evaluation recommendation 2. UNDP should assume a proactive role to respond to national priorities.				
Management response With the above strategic priorities in place, UNDP now needs to carry these commitments through to country-level programming as the next cycle of common country assessments (CCAs), United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs) and country programme documents are developed and approved, especially in least developed countries (LDCs) and small-island developing States (SIDS). UNDP should advocate and seek opportunities to incorporate environmental and energy concerns into national development plans and programmes, and develop country level capacities to work on these.				
Key action(s)	**Time frame**	**Responsible unit(s)**	**Tracking**	
			Status	**Comments**
2.1 As part of the CCA/UNDAF/country programme document preparation process, formulate strategic environment and energy priorities in response to national sustainable development goals, especially in LDCs and small-island developing States, including those priorities not eligible for GEF funding.	July 2008 – Dec. 2009	Country offices and regional bureaux		
2.2 Advocate and seek opportunities to incorporate environment and energy concerns into national development plans and programmes.	Jan. 2008 – Dec. 2011	Country offices, with support from BDP/EEG, regional service centres (RSCs) and regional bureaux	In progress	Part of this work is being supported by the joint UNEP-UNDP Poverty and Environment Initiative.
2.3 Further strengthen country-level capacities in the field of environment and energy by, inter alia, promoting a vibrant 'community of practice' and knowledge networks.	July 2008 – Dec. 2011	BDP and regional bureaux/RSCs	In progress	'EE-Net' now has 1,400 subscribers. BDP is rolling out an improved knowledge management system called 'Teamworks'.

2.4 Conduct periodic stocktaking of country-level environment and energy portfolios.	Annually from March 2008 – March 2011	BDP/EEG/RSCs		
Evaluation recommendation 3. UNDP should identify and implement institutional arrangements and incentives to promote the mainstreaming of environment throughout all major practice areas.				
Management response UNDP needs to give greater attention to incorporating environment and energy into its main practices (poverty reduction, democratic governance, and crisis prevention and recovery). This requires commitment at all levels of the organization and not only within the environment and energy practice. UNDP should also accelerate the transition of climate change adaptation from an environmental issue to a UNDP-wide development concern. Adaptation to climate change must be considered a flagship priority for UNDP as a whole.				
Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Status	Comments
3.1 Add guidelines on environmental and social safeguards to 'Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures' guide.	April 2008 – Dec. 2008	BDP/EEG	In progress	
3.2 Continue rolling out the approved climate-change strategy to all practices, regional bureaux and country offices.	Oct. 2007 – Dec. 2009	BDP/EEG	In progress	The draft climate-change strategy was presented to resident coordinators and resident representatives during Oct. 2007 – Feb. 2008.
3.3 Strengthen collaboration with the poverty practice in the implementation of the Poverty and Environment Initiative.	July 2008 – July 2010	BDP/EEG, BDP/Poverty Group and country offices		

3.4 Strengthen collaboration with the governance practice in areas related to the governance of environmental resources, such as land tenure, resource ownership and water resource management.	July 2008 – Dec. 2011	BDP/EEG, BDP/Democratic Governance Group (DGG) and country offices		
3.5 Strengthen collaboration with the crisis prevention and recovery practice in areas related to environmental degradation and political instability.	July 2008 – Dec. 2011	BDP/EEG, BDP/DGG and country offices		

Evaluation recommendation 4. UNDP should identify options for strengthening the environment and energy capacities of the country offices.

Management response

As country offices are the front lines of UNDP engagement with its programme countries, it is critical that country staff – from the Resident Representative down to the programme assistants – embody the highest levels of professionalism, competence and commitment not only to the core UNDP mission of poverty reduction but also those factors that dramatically affect the levels of poverty, such as environment quality. Thus UNDP must invest and invest again in the capacities of these staff through, inter alia, training, knowledge networks and knowledge products

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Status	Comments
4.1 Intensify efforts to focus the attention of resident representatives and country directors on environment and energy as a key component of sustainable development and build their individual capacities in these areas.	July 2008 – July 2010	BDP/EEG and regional bureaux		
4.2 Establish new positions, upgrade existing posts, and increase the availability of staff based in the regional centres.	July 2008 – June 2009	BDP and regional bureaux	In progress	Regional practice leaders are being recruited in each RSC, some at the L6 level.
4.3 Explore improvements in career opportunities for technical specialists based in regional centres and country offices.	Sep. 2008 – Dec 2008	OHR		